

Serial No. 09/396,565

**REMARKS**

Thorough examination of the application is sincerely appreciated.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter in claims 3, 5, 8, 9, 14, 16, 19 and 20.

Further according to the Final Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10-13, 15, 17, 18 and 21-25 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,949,492 (Mankovitz) in view of US Patent 6,698,654 (Zuppich) and further in view of US Patent 5,798,507 (Kawagishi).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and explicitly traverses, the reason for rejecting Applicant's claims. However, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this application, claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention. As the result, it will be shown that Applicant's claims, as amended, are not rendered obvious by Mankovitz, Zuppich and Kawagishi, whether considered separately or in combination.

None of the references relied upon in the Final Office Action teaches or suggests, among other things, the feature of "the second processor receiving a message from the first processor, the message identifying the agent program to be downloaded, and in response to the message the second processor downloading the agent program from the removable card via a data channel created between the removable card and the host device" as recited in Applicant's claim 1, for example. It is believed that the Examiner admitted that this subject matter is allowable over the prior art of record.

At least for this reason, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 1, as amended, has been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

**Serial No. 09/396,565**

Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, which has been shown to be allowable over the prior art references. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim. Applicant submits that the reason for the rejection of claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11 has been overcome and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of those claims.

Analysis of independent claim 12 is analogous to the one of claim 1, as presented hereinabove. To avoid repetition, claim 12 will not be discussed in detail with the understanding that it is patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 12.

Claims 13, 15, 17, 18, 21 and 22 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 12, which has been shown to be allowable over the prior art references. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim. Applicant submits that the reason for the rejection of claims 13, 15, 17, 18, 21 and 22 has been overcome and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of those claims.

Analysis of independent claims 23 and 24 is analogous to the one of claim 1, as presented hereinabove. To avoid repetition, claims 23 and 24 will not be discussed in detail with the understanding that those claims are patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 23 and 24.

With regard to claim 25, it has been cancelled. The rejection of claim 25 is thus obviated.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Mankovitz, Zuppich and Kawagishi, whether considered separately or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present invention because the combination fails to teach or suggest all of the features of

**Serial No. 09/396,565**

Applicant's claims, as discussed hereinabove. Withdrawal of the rejections is, therefore, respectfully requested.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's correspondence and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason this application is not considered to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

May 15, 2006

By Larry Liberchuk  
Larry Liberchuk, Reg. No. 40,352  
Senior IP Counsel  
Philips Electronics N.A. Corporation  
914-333-9602